Global Politics And Security Intimidations

Posted on January 8, 2020

Introduction

The attacks of September 11, 2001 changed how governments discussed terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, state failure, intelligence, and the permissible use of force. The original essay correctly identified 9/11 as a turning point and connected it with the Bush Doctrine, Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, and the revival of alliances with strategically useful but politically controversial partners. Its analysis, however, treated global security mainly through an American counterterrorism lens and used "preventive" and "preemptive" war inconsistently. Security in 2026 is a wider field: terrorism remains significant, while interstate war, nuclear modernization, cyber operations, coercive economic measures, climate stress, disinformation, and attacks on civilian infrastructure interact with it. This essay uses a threat-and-response framework to examine how global politics has evolved since 9/11 and why durable security requires law, intelligence, diplomacy, resilience, and human rights as well as military capability.

Security Before and After September 11

During the 1990s, many Western policy debates emphasized globalization, peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention, ethnic conflict, and the management of regional crises after the Cold War. Terrorism was already a serious threat, but 9/11 demonstrated that a non-state network could produce mass casualties at the political and financial center of a superpower. The attacks altered perceptions of distance and warning. Security planning increasingly focused on transnational networks, financing, aviation, intelligence sharing, border systems, and the possibility that terrorists might acquire chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear materials. Pyszczynski, Solomon, and Greenberg (2003) also showed how fear and mortality awareness influenced public judgment after the attacks. The resulting policy shift was therefore strategic and psychological. Governments expanded coercive powers while citizens became more willing to accept actions presented as protection from catastrophic uncertainty.

Terrorism as a Networked and Adaptive Threat

Terrorism is a tactic rather than one ideology or organization. Groups use violence against civilians or symbolic targets to intimidate wider audiences, provoke overreaction, recruit supporters, and alter political behavior. Al-Qaeda's hierarchical network and external operations shaped the first phase of the post-9/11 response. Later organizations, including the Islamic State, combined territorial control, insurgency, online propaganda, foreign-fighter recruitment, and inspired attacks. Contemporary

threats can involve formal groups, local affiliates, lone actors, and loosely connected online communities. The United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism emphasizes international cooperation, prevention, capacity building, and implementation of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (UNOCT, 2026). Military force can disrupt camps or leadership, but it cannot alone resolve political grievances, governance failure, financing, prison recruitment, or digital radicalization.

From Deterrence to Preemption and Prevention

Traditional deterrence attempts to prevent attack by threatening unacceptable retaliation. Preemption refers to force against an attack believed to be imminent, whereas preventive war seeks to eliminate a potential future danger before it becomes imminent. The distinction matters legally and ethically. The 2002 U.S. National Security Strategy argued that Cold War concepts were inadequate against terrorists and hostile states seeking weapons of mass destruction and asserted a broad right to act before threats fully materialized. Supporters believed waiting could be catastrophic. Critics argued that preventive logic allows states to attack on uncertain predictions and weakens the UN Charter's prohibition on force. If every state claims the right to destroy a possible future capability, insecurity can expand rather than contract. A credible policy must therefore distinguish reliable evidence of imminent attack from speculation about long-term intentions.

Afghanistan: Disrupting a Safe Haven

After 9/11, the United States and allies intervened in Afghanistan against al-Qaeda and the Taliban government that had hosted its leadership. The initial operation removed the regime rapidly and disrupted training infrastructure. The mission then expanded into state-building, counterinsurgency, security-force development, and support for a new political order. These objectives proved difficult to align. Corruption, civilian harm, contested legitimacy, regional sanctuary, weak institutions, and shifting international commitment undermined the project. The Taliban returned to power in August 2021 after the withdrawal of foreign forces. Afghanistan demonstrates the gap between defeating an armed formation and creating a legitimate political settlement. External forces can change control of territory, but durable governance depends on domestic institutions, social coalitions, regional politics, and the public's experience of security and justice.

Pakistan and the Dilemmas of Strategic Partnership

Pakistan became essential to post-9/11 operations because of geography, intelligence, logistics, nuclear capability, and influence in Afghanistan. Cooperation included arrests and support for U.S. operations, while profound distrust persisted over militant sanctuaries, sovereignty, drone strikes, and competing regional priorities. Osama bin Laden's discovery in Abbottabad in 2011 intensified

questions about knowledge and control within Pakistan, though the evidence did not justify treating the state as a single actor with one policy. Civilian leaders, military institutions, intelligence services, political parties, and local networks have different interests. The relationship illustrates a recurring feature of global politics: states cooperate against one threat while competing over others. Alliances based only on immediate operational need can create dependency without strategic agreement or democratic accountability.

Iraq and the Cost of Intelligence Failure

The 2003 invasion of Iraq was justified partly through claims that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction and might connect such capabilities with terrorism. Stockpiles matching the central prewar claims were not found, and official inquiries identified major intelligence and policy failures. The invasion removed a brutal regime, but it also dismantled institutions, intensified sectarian conflict, produced large-scale civilian harm, and created space later exploited by extremist groups. Iraq illustrates why uncertainty should not automatically favor war. Intelligence is rarely complete, but decision-makers must test assumptions, examine dissent, distinguish capability from intention, and evaluate the consequences of regime collapse. Preventive war based on erroneous claims damages legitimacy and can generate the very instability it was meant to prevent.

Weapons of Mass Destruction and Nuclear Risk

Nuclear weapons remain a central global security danger because their destructive capacity, escalation dynamics, and long-term effects exceed ordinary military risk. Concerns include state arsenals, proliferation, command-and-control failure, miscalculation, and the security of materials. Biological and chemical weapons create different detection and response problems. Counterproliferation includes treaties, safeguards, export controls, intelligence, diplomacy, interdiction, and emergency preparedness. SIPRI's *Yearbook 2026* describes continuing nuclear modernization and weakened arms-control conditions alongside armed conflict and rising military competition (SIPRI, 2026). Deterrence may reduce deliberate attack between nuclear powers, but it cannot eliminate accident, unauthorized use, cyber interference, or escalation from a conventional conflict. Risk reduction and verified arms control remain necessary even between strategic rivals.

The Return of Major Interstate War

The post-9/11 focus on terrorism sometimes obscured the continued importance of state power. Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 demonstrated that territorial conquest, artillery warfare, mobilization, sanctions, energy coercion, and nuclear signaling remained features of European security. Competition involving the United States and China has increased concern about the Taiwan Strait, maritime disputes, technology, and military escalation. Regional wars and rivalries in the

Middle East, Africa, and Asia further complicate alliance commitments. Interstate conflict differs from counterterrorism because adversaries possess territory, armed forces, economic capacity, and sometimes nuclear weapons. Policy must combine deterrence with crisis communication and diplomacy. Treating every rivalry as an existential struggle can make compromise politically impossible and accidental escalation more likely.

Cyber Operations and Attacks Below the Threshold of War

Cyber operations can steal intelligence, disrupt services, influence public debate, and prepare access to critical infrastructure. Attribution is difficult, and states often act below the threshold that would provoke a conventional military response. Ransomware groups may operate for profit while benefiting from permissive jurisdictions. Elections and public trust can be targeted through hacking and information operations, but democratic societies also risk exaggerating foreign influence and ignoring domestic political responsibility. Cybersecurity depends on resilient networks, secure software, trained personnel, information sharing, backups, and rapid recovery—not only offensive retaliation. International norms should protect hospitals, energy systems, financial networks, and other civilian infrastructure, even though verification and enforcement remain difficult.

Disinformation, Fear, and Political Manipulation

Security threats are interpreted through media, leadership, and collective emotion. Landau et al. (2004) found that reminders of mortality and 9/11 affected support for President George W. Bush, illustrating how threat can influence political preference. Governments and movements may use fear to frame opponents as disloyal, justify extraordinary power, or simplify complex conflicts. Disinformation amplifies these dynamics by mixing falsehood, selective truth, and identity-based narratives. The appropriate response is not unrestricted censorship, which can itself be abused. Democratic resilience requires transparent official communication, independent journalism, media literacy, disclosure of influence operations, and institutional trust earned through accuracy. Citizens must be protected from manipulation without turning security agencies into arbiters of permissible political opinion.

Climate, Resources, and Human Security

Climate change is not a conventional enemy, yet it can multiply security risks by intensifying heat, drought, displacement, food insecurity, disaster, and competition over resources. Its effects interact with governance, inequality, and existing conflict rather than causing war automatically. Human security broadens the focus from defending borders to protecting people from severe threats to life and dignity. Pandemics, forced displacement, hunger, and environmental disaster can destabilize

societies as profoundly as armed attack. This perspective does not make every social problem a military matter. On the contrary, it shows why health systems, infrastructure, social protection, and international development are security investments. Militarizing climate or migration can criminalize vulnerable populations instead of addressing the conditions producing movement.

Economic Coercion and Interdependence

Globalization creates mutual benefit and strategic vulnerability. States can use sanctions, export controls, finance, energy supply, investment screening, and control of critical technologies to influence others. Economic coercion may provide an alternative to war, but broad measures can impose severe costs on civilians and encourage evasion or rival economic blocs. Supply-chain dependence in semiconductors, medicines, food, and energy has become a security concern. Complete self-sufficiency is unrealistic and economically costly. Resilience involves diversification, reserves, allied coordination, and transparent risk assessment rather than indiscriminate separation. Economic policy should be evaluated by its political objective, humanitarian effects, enforceability, and exit conditions.

International Law and the Use of Force

The UN Charter generally prohibits the threat or use of force against another state's territorial integrity or political independence, while recognizing self-defense after an armed attack and Security Council authorization under collective-security provisions. Disputes arise over anticipatory self-defense, non-state actors operating from another state, humanitarian intervention, and the responsibility to protect. Law does not eliminate power politics, but it establishes standards, procedures, and vocabulary through which conduct can be contested. Selective compliance weakens legitimacy: states cannot credibly defend sovereignty in one case while dismissing it in another without explanation. Even when military action is lawful, proportionality, distinction, necessity, detention rules, and civilian protection remain ethical and legal obligations.

Counterterrorism and Human Rights

Post-9/11 counterterrorism produced surveillance, detention, targeted killing, financial controls, watchlists, and expanded intelligence cooperation. Some measures prevented violence; others generated torture, unlawful detention, discrimination, and secrecy. Abuses are not merely moral failures detached from strategy. They can damage alliances, supply propaganda, create false intelligence, and alienate communities whose cooperation is essential. Effective prevention distinguishes evidence-based risk from profiling by religion or ethnicity, provides judicial review, and limits emergency powers. Security institutions need authority, but authority should be specific, reviewable, and temporary where exceptional. The test of constitutional government is not whether it

acts against threats, but whether it can do so without abandoning the principles it claims to defend.

Building a Layered Security Strategy

No single instrument can manage the present threat environment. A layered strategy uses intelligence to identify specific risk, law enforcement to investigate networks, diplomacy to reduce conflict, military forces to deter or respond to armed attack, public health to manage biological threats, and resilient infrastructure to reduce vulnerability. It also invests in arms control, community prevention, development, and accountable governance. Partnerships should be based on defined interests and standards rather than permanent approval of a partner's domestic conduct. Scenario planning can test assumptions, while red teams challenge consensus before decisions become irreversible. Success should be measured not only by enemies killed or attacks disrupted, but by whether violence, recruitment, civilian harm, and political instability decline over time.

Conclusion

September 11 changed global security by demonstrating the destructive reach of transnational terrorism and by encouraging a broader willingness to use force against uncertain future threats. Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq reveal both the operational necessity and the limits of this approach. Terrorism remains important, but it now coexists with major-power rivalry, nuclear modernization, cyber operations, climate stress, disinformation, economic coercion, and interstate war. Military capability is necessary in some circumstances, yet preventive logic and fear-driven policy can create new insecurity when evidence, law, and political consequences are neglected. Durable security requires a layered system of deterrence, intelligence, diplomacy, resilience, human rights, and international cooperation. The central lesson after 9/11 is not that force must always be used earlier. It is that complex threats demand disciplined judgment before irreversible power is used.

References

Landau, M. J., Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., Cohen, F., Pyszczynski, T., Arndt, J., Miller, C. H., Ogilvie, D. M., & Cook, A. (2004). Deliver us from evil: The effects of mortality salience and reminders of 9/11 on support for President George W. Bush. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(9), 1136–1150. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204267988

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. (2004). *The 9/11 Commission report*. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Greenberg, J. (2003). *In the wake of 9/11: The psychology of terror*. American Psychological Association.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2026). *SIPRI yearbook 2026: Armaments, disarmament and international security*. Oxford University Press.

United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations*.

United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism. (2026). *United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy*. United Nations.

Wright, L. (2006). *The looming tower: Al-Qaeda and the road to 9/11*. Alfred A. Knopf.